Message

From: Praskins, Wayne [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=4F47BC0A2C2E42A98347D59CD1A98B19-WPRASKIN]
Sent: 12/16/2020 4:53:59 PM
To: Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) [David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil]
CC: Clements, Julie A CIV (USA) [Julie.A.Clements@usace.army.mil]; Rankins, Jonathan E CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) [Jonathan.E.Rankins@usace.army.mil]
Subject: RE: Hunters Point Buildings Radiological Rework

Dave –

Thanks for your feedback. Do you have a few minutes to talk later today or tomorrow?

Wayne Praskins | Superfund Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-7-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-972-3181

From: Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil>
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 6:51 AM
To: Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>
Cc: Clements, Julie A CIV (USA) <Julie.A.Clements@usace.army.mil>; Rankins, Jonathan E CIV USARMY CEMVS (USA) <Jonathan.E.Rankins@usace.army.mil>
Subject: RE: Hunters Point Buildings Radiological Rework

Wayne, Thank you, it is interesting. Still making it a model argument but now stating the EPA model does not match the Conceptual Site Model. A valid argument, but I would say the USDON use of RESRADBLD does not match the actual Conceptual Site Model either. Both models can be tweaked or post processing of modeled results can be done to make the better match with a agreed to Conceptual Site Model. I really think that is first step, an agreed to Conceptual Site Model. Really has little to do with what computer code is used, just need to know what to model to know program inputs and how to post process the results. Best approach may be to settle on CSM and do risk assessment by hand (RAGS).

Per my email yesterday I think the USDON RESRAD BLD inputs for air fraction and direct ingestion may be underestimating some dose and risks. Combined with an underestimate of risks from the external pathway (due to FGR-13 update and assumed RESRADBLD converting dose to risk for external pathway) I believe EPA has a case that the USDON model is biased low.

My personal opinion is that RESRADBLD is more flexible and inputs can be modified to cover a wider range of site conditions to provide results requiring less post processing than would be required using BPRG. My future use of RESRADBLD will now require a post result adjustment of the external risk output or at least a discussion of the low bias in the uncertainty section of the risk assessment.

Please let me know if I can assist further.

Dave

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year!

From: Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 7:18 PM

To: Hays, David C Jr CIV USARMY CENWK (USA) <David.C.Hays@usace.army.mil>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] FW: Hunters Point Buildings Radiological Rework

Dave - Attached is the Navy's response to the Region's August 20, 2020 letter on the building remediation goals at the Hunters Point site.

Wayne Praskins | Superfund Project Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Region 9
75 Hawthorne St. (SFD-7-3)
San Francisco, CA 94105
415-972-3181

From: Ostrowski, Kimberly A CIV USN COMNAVFACENGCOM DC (USA) <kimberly.ostrowski@navy.mil>
Sent: Friday, December 11, 2020 2:37 PM
To: Manzanilla, Enrique <Manzanilla.Enrique@epa.gov>
Cc: Duchnak, Laura S CIV USN COMNAVFACENGCOM DC (USA) <laura.duchnak@navy.mil>; Lansdale, Lawrence L CIV USN (USA) <lawrence.lansdale@navy.mil>; Macchiarella, Thomas L CIV USN COMNAVFACENGCOM DC (USA) <thomas.macchiarella@navy.mil>; Robinson, Derek J CIV USN NAVFAC SW SAN CA (USA) <derek.j.robinson1@navy.mil>; Herrera, Angeles <Herrera.Angeles@epa.gov>; Chesnutt, John <Chesnutt.John@epa.gov>; Praskins, Wayne <Praskins.Wayne@epa.gov>; juanita.bacey@dtsc.ca.gov; Han, Terry@CDPH <terry.han@cdph.ca.gov>; tina.low@waterboards.ca.gov; amy.brownell@sfdph.org
Subject: Hunters Point Buildings Radiological Rework

Enrique,

I am submitting the attached letter on behalf of Laura Duchnak.

v/r,
Kim